UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

1

2

4

United States of America,

Plaintiff

Defendants

5

6 || v.

7 Joshua Sadat Washington, et al.,

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No.: 2:16-cr-00279-JAD-PAL

Amended¹ Order Granting Motion to Continue Sentencing Hearing and Denying Other Relief

[ECF Nos. 227, 236, 238, 239]

Defendant Joshua Sadat Washington was convicted of interference with commerce by robbery, brandishing a firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence, and transportation of stolen property after the jury in his March 2018 trial returned a guilty verdict on all counts.² Sentencing is scheduled for June 11, 2018. Washington moves to continue that sentencing hearing for two months to permit him time to obtain mitigating evidence and to file objections to his presentence investigation report.³ The government does not object.⁴ Accordingly, the court finds good cause to grant the two-month continuance.

Washington has also requested expedited copies of his trial transcripts "to assist with preparation for post-verdict motions and appellate motions." However, he has not shown that he requires such transcripts to prepare his post-trial motions or needs them immediately for his eventual appeal. He, in fact, filed a motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict and an extensive supplement to that motion without the transcripts and has not demonstrated that the

¹ This order replaces ECF No. 241.

² ECF No. 225.

³ ECF No. 238.

⁴ ECF No. 240.

⁵ ECF No. 227.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

transcripts are now necessary at all.⁶ So, I deny Washington's Motion Requesting Trial Transcripts (Expedited Request).

Washington has also filed an Ex Parte Emergency Motion for an order allowing him to consult with an expert prior to sentencing. Washington has not identified any such expert, described the work to be performed, or identified the cost associated with this effort, and he does not need court approval to consult with an expert that he pays for. He also does not specifically request funds for this purpose. Although the court assumes that Washington is really asking for court funds to permit him to hire such an expert (and, for that, he would need court approval), his request is simply not developed enough for the court to determine what, exactly, Washington is asking for and whether the court should grant that request. Accordingly, Washington's exparte emergency motion for an order approving expert evidence is DENIED without prejudice to Washington's ability to seek funds for this purpose through the CJA process (likely with the assistance of standby counsel).

Finally, Washington has filed a separate motion asking the court to grant various of his motions because nobody has opposed them. Not all motions in criminal cases require parties to respond. This is particularly true when opposing parties would not have an interest in the subject matter of a motion (like with Washington's request for expedited trial transcripts⁸), or when the party who is the subject of a motion was never served with that motion (as appears to be the case

⁶ ECF Nos. 228, 230. I find this reason alone sufficient to deny the transcript request. My

original order added as a second independent basis for denial that "appellate counsel has already requested the trial transcripts from the court reporter for the purpose of appeal." This was an

error as appellate counsel has not yet been appointed and the transcripts have not been ordered.

The court anticipates that appellate counsel will be appointed after sentencing (assuming of course that the post-trial motion is denied), and appellate counsel will order any transcripts

19

20

28

⁷ ECF No. 239.

necessary for preparing the appeal.

²¹ 22

²³

²⁴

²⁵

²⁶

²⁷

⁸ See ECF No. 227.

1	with Washington's request to hold Corporation Trust Company of Nevada in contempt ⁹).
2	Accordingly, I do not find that Washington's pending motions are the type that the court can
3	grant merely because nobody opposed them, so I deny his motion to grant these pending motions
4	simply because no opposition was filed.
5	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Washington's Motion to Continue
6	Sentencing Hearing [ECF No. 238] is GRANTED. The June 11, 2018, sentencing hearing is
7	VACATED and continued to August 13, 2018, at 2:30 p.m.;
8	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Washington's Motion Requesting Trial Transcripts and
9	Motion to Grant Doc # 227, 231 due to Failure of Valid Respond [sic] by Court Ordered
10	Response Dates [ECF Nos. 227, 236] are DENIED; and
11	Finally, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Washington's Ex Parte Emergency Motion
12	Requesting an Order Approving Expert Evidence [ECF No. 239] is DENIED without prejudice.
13	Dated: June 12, 2018
14	
15	U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	⁹ See ECF No. 231 (the certificate of service lists the Clerk of Court as the only recipient).
28	